

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-40, 42-55, 57, 59-61, 63-65, 67-69, 71-73 and 75-85 remain pending. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-40, 42-55, 57, 59-61, 63-65, 67-69, 71-73 and 75-85 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 11, 20, 28, 73, 76, 79, 82, and 85 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-40, 42-55, 57, 59-61, 63-65, 67-69, 71-73 and 75-85 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,303, to Foreman, et al. (“Foreman”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,925 to Rosser, et al., (“Rosser”).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include presenting capture information from the time based stream of information on a portion of a first interface on a display while the capture information is acquired from the information source in a capture mode, the capture mode to import the time based stream of information into the system; and presenting on the first interface on the display at least one enabled control element, which is to control editing of the information while presenting the capture information from the time based stream of information that is currently being imported into the system on the first interface.

It is respectfully submitted that Foreman does not teach or suggest a combination with Rosser, and Rosser does not teach or suggest a combination with Foreman. It would be impermissible hindsight based on Applicants' own disclosure, to combine Rosser and Foreman. Foreman discloses a plurality of interfaces for planning, capturing, and editing video. The Examiner reference to Foreman (col. 9, lines 20-32, and col. 10, lines 27-33) rather discloses an interface 54 for capturing video. In particular, Foreman discloses that when all shots have been associated with clips, the user can go to the next selectable interface to edit the movie (col.10, lines 27-33). In contrast, amended claim 1 discloses presenting on the first interface on the display at least one enabled control element, which is to control editing of the information and presenting the capture information from the time based stream of information that is currently being imported into the system on the same first interface Rosser, in contrast, discloses image insertion in video streams and, similarly to Foreman, fails to disclose presenting on the first interface on the display at least one enabled control element, which is to control editing of the information and presenting the capture information from the time based stream of information that is currently being imported into the system on the same first interface, as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Foreman, Rosser, nor any combination thereof discloses the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foreman in view of Rosser.

Given that amended claims 11, 20, 28, 73, 76, 79, 82, and 85 contain related limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 11, 20, 28, 73, 76, 79, 82, and 85 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foreman in view of Rosser.

Because claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29-31, 33-36, 75, 77-78, 80-81, and 82 depend from amended claims 11, 20, 28, 73, 76, 79, 82, and 85 and add additional

limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2-4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29-31, 33-36, 75, 77-78, 80-81, and 82 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foreman in view of Rosser.

Claim 37 includes automatically presenting capture information from the time based stream of information on a display in response to the detecting while the capture information is acquired from the information source in a capture mode, the capture mode to import the time based stream of information into the system, wherein the capture information is displayed at a first rate that is not less than the transfer rate for the time based stream of information using an interrupt procedure that iterates at a second rate that is not less than the transfer rate of the time based stream of information.

It is respectfully submitted that Foreman does not teach or suggest a combination with Rosser, and Rosser does not teach or suggest a combination with Foreman. It would be impermissible hindsight based on Applicants' own disclosure, to combine Rosser and Foreman. The Examiner's reference to Foreman (Abstract, col. 8, lines 50-61) rather discloses that the video information is captured into a timeline representation of a video program. In particular, Foreman discloses

b. associating motion video information stored in the data files on the computer system with each clip in the representation of the motion picture and storing for each clip a reference to the associated data file and a range within the data file, such that the duration of each clip corresponds to the associated motion video information; c. displaying to the user the sequence of clips as a timeline and in a video window on a display for the computer system according using the associated motion video information; and d. allowing the user to modify the sequence of clips in the computer system. (Foreman, col. 18, lines 3-14) (emphasis added)

Thus, Foreman rather discloses capturing the video information into the sequence of clips (timeline. In contrast, claim 37 refers to displaying of the capture information at a first rate that is not less than the transfer rate for the time based stream of information. Additionally, it is

submitted that Foreman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest an interrupt procedure that iterates at a second rate that is not less than the transfer rate of the time based stream of information.

Rosser, in contrast, discloses image insertion in video streams (Abstract), and similarly to Foreman, fails to disclose the discussed limitations.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 37 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foreman in view of Rosser.

Given that claims 38-40, 42-45, 47-50, 52, 57-61, 63-64, 65, 67-68, 69, and 71-72 contain related limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 38-40, 42-45, 47-50, 52, 57-61, 63-64, 65, 67-68, 69, and 71-72 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foreman in view of Rosser.


Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: December 22, 2006

By: 
Tatiana Rossin
Reg. No.: 56,833

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(408) 720-8300